

Wu 113122cont

REMARKS

Claims 1, 17, and 23 were objected to. The first claim in the case is claim 13, but the substance of the objection strongly suggests that the Examiner meant to refer to claim 13 and not to claim 1. It is so treated herein.

Claims 13, 16, and 17 are amended to overcome the objection, and claim 23 is canceled.

Claims 13-14, 16-24 were rejected under the judicially created nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. This rejection is overcome by the enclosed terminal disclaimer.

Claims 16-19 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claim 16 is canceled, and claims 17-19 are amended to depend on claim 15, thereby overcoming the rejection.

Claims 13-15 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Escola et al, US Patent 5,432,929 ('929). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The '929 reference teaches an arrangement where a user sends a C&S (compare and swap) order. The order includes -- as shown by the table at col. 6, lines 35-30 -- a comparison key (bytes 4-15 of the C&S command) and a key-lock string (bytes 16-527 of the C&S command). When the C&S order is received, the subsystem that receives it reads a stored key-lock string from the device specified in the "start I/O" operation and compares the first 12 bytes of the read string to the comparison key. If they match, the key-lock string of the C&S order are caused to replace the stored key-lock string, and the Operation Status is set to hexcode 00 (i.e., X'00'). Otherwise, the Operation Status is set to X'01' and an Exception Status is set to x' 0D. See col. 6, lines 41-60. Thus, the C&S order returns the preset values X'00' and X'01' for the Operation Status, (and when the Operation Status is X'01' it also sets the Exception Status with the preset value X'0D').

Claim 13, in contradistinction, returns the state of the key lock as it exists when command X arrives, which is either a 0 or a non-zero value that uniquely identifies a user U_i that previously set said lock. The latter, of course, is not a preset value.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that claim 1 is not anticipated by the reference, and neither are the claims that depend on claim 13.

Wu 113122cont


Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '929 reference in view of Govindaraju et al, US Patent 6,112,222. Since claim 16 is canceled herein and claim 17 now depends on a different claim the rejection is moot.

New claims 25-27 are included. Support for the claims is found in the specification. In particular, support for the $S=B_a$ limitation of claim 26 is found in the control path of FIG. 8 from decision block 99 to block 94.

In light of the above amendments, remarks, and the submitted terminal disclaimer, applicants respectfully submit that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of the outstanding claims are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,
Yuguang Wu

Dated: 4/25/06

By 
Henry T. Brendzel
Reg. No. 26,844
Phone (973) 467-2025
Fax (973) 467-6589
email brendzel@comcast.net